

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 9, 2014

AGENDA

- 1. Tuller Flats Residential Development
13-121INF**
**Informal
(Discussion only)**
- 2. Avondale Woods – Avery Road
12-084Z/PDP/PP**
**Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Preliminary Plat
(Tabled 7-0)**
- 3. Perimeter Center PCD, Subarea C - Noah's Special Events Center 5555 Wall Street
13-099Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat
(Tabled 7-0)**

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Joe Budde and Victoria Newell. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Justin Goodwin, Jennifer Readler, Aaron Stanford, Alan Perkins, Steve Skeldon, Andrew Crozier, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Kristin Yorko, Paul Hammersmith, Megan O'Callahan (Director of Public Service), Barb Cox, and Flora Rogers.

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Ms. Newell seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were corrections needed for the December 5, 2013 meeting minutes. [There were none.]

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the December 5, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Kramb seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes. Mr. Hardt, abstain; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were corrections needed for the December 12, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Hardt said on page 6, fourth paragraph from the top add after public street "then it needs to be constructed a certain way" and page 12 bottom of the page include "and therefore significantly larger" to the end of the sentence attributed to Mr. Hardt.

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the December 12, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Fishman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, abstain; Ms. Newell, abstain; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 – 2.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes took a quick straw poll of the audience to see who was in attendance for each of the cases.

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined the order of the cases heard would be Case 3, 2, and 1. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**1. Tuller Flats Residential Development
13-121INF**

Informal

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is for informal review and non-binding feedback for a multi-family residential development consisting of 392 apartment units within 30 three-story apartment buildings, a clubhouse/community center, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 17 acres. The site is located on the south side of Tuller Road, approximately 700 feet east of Tuller Ridge Drive and is zoned Bridge Street Corridor Residential District.

Justin Goodwin presented this application and said the project began the development review process with a pre-application review with the Administrative Review Team in November, which is the first step of the development review process as laid out in the Bridge Street District Zoning Regulations. He said the applicant has also proposed some preliminary terms of a potential development agreement with the City of Dublin that is necessary to complete some significant public infrastructure improvements that would be associated with this project. He said City Council has expressed a desire that for cases that include a potential development agreement, applications come to the Planning Commission as an informal review before beginning the formal development review process. He said the applicant has responded to a number of the comments that the ART provided to the original set of plans and has prepared this informal review application for the Commission's review.

Mr. Goodwin said the site is 17 acres located south of Tuller Road and north of the Sycamore Ridge Apartment complex. He said there are office buildings immediately to the west and to the north across Tuller Road and the Byers Auto site is located immediately to the east and Greystone Mews is very close to the southeast. He said the existing Sycamore Ridge Park which is currently undeveloped is immediately to the west.

Mr. Goodwin showed the Bridge Street District Area Plan and said this site is within the Character Area called the Tuller Greenway District. He said the plan shows the street network and general block framework planned for this entire area of the Bridge Street District. He said the key components of the plan include a greenway along the planned John Shields Parkway, that will extend from Riverside Drive to Village Parkway and a cycletrack that will create a loop system throughout this portion of the Bridge Street District connecting to the planned pedestrian bridge and across the vehicular bridge of John Shields Parkway in the future.

Mr. Goodwin said some of the design recommendations for the Tuller Greenway District include the creation of new neighborhoods with a variety of housing types, a new greenway and streets that link to existing and future neighborhoods, and open spaces like court yards and pocket parks that are integrated with residential building designs.

Mr. Goodwin said the site is zoned in the BSC Residential District, immediately to the east the land is zoned BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, land to the north of Tuller Road is zoned Office Residential District and the Sycamore Ridge Park is in the Public District. He said the Bridge Street District street network map shows that the general framework of planned streets in the area and the street and block requirements of the Code will result in the new street system. He noted that the planned John Shields Parkway is a principal frontage street which result in a number of street frontage requirements

related to placement of buildings and vehicular access points. He said Tuller Road is also a principal frontage street.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has provided an area context plan that shows the proposed site on the 17 acres in relationship to the surrounding development and shows the street network map with some modifications to accommodate the proposal itself. He said it also shows to the west the Vrable skilled nursing facility and the first section of John Shields Parkway and will be constructed with that development.

Mr. Goodwin said it shows the conceptual Bridge Park Mixed Use Development that Crawford Hoying brought to the Commission as an informal review recently. He said the intent is to provide an understanding of how this development will fit with the existing and the future planned developments.

Mr. Goodwin said the proposed conceptual plan is for 392 residential units in 30 3-story apartment buildings with a club house located in the center of the site, with approximately 2 acres of open space provided as a 60 foot wide greenway along John Shields Parkway, consistent with the Community Plan, and multiple pocket parks primarily in the center of the site. He said there is a combination of public and private streets and parking provided in a combination of garages integrated with the apartment buildings, off-street surface parking areas and on-street parking.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant is potentially interested in additional development on the land immediately to the east of this site with additional residential/multi-family apartment units, which is not the focus of this informal review.

Mr. Goodwin said as part of the development agreement being considered between the developer and the City of Dublin, the applicant is proposing a TIF agreement to construct a larger portion of John Shields Parkway than what would just be associated with this site, extending from Tuller Ridge Drive from the west to the Village Parkway to the east, which will be dedicated as public right-of-way. He said the plan also shows a street connection to Hobbs Landing Drive in the Greystone Mews development and discussions have occurred with M/I Homes to complete that connection. He said the plan shows the eventual extension of Hobbs Landing Drive northward to Tuller Road and would provide the eastern frontage for one of the proposed development blocks, however, that particular piece of roadway is not proposed as part of this immediate 17 acres and would be considered a future phase. He said this would create a temporary condition in which two buildings would not immediately have street frontage, but would have access from other portions of the site.

Mr. Goodwin said the internal neighborhood streets are proposed as public access easements rather than public rights-of-way, however the applicant proposes that these be constructed entirely to public street standards consistent with street sections engineering is developing for streets within the Bridge Street District. He said the reason for this approach is because the City of Columbus has a requirement that prohibits private water lines from crossing a public right-of-way. He said the private water line could cross what is essentially built as a public street, but remains private with a public access easement. He said this is a policy decision that City Council will have to make. He said the concept is currently being reviewed by a number of staff and variety of departments to understand the overall implications that this approach would have. He said Planning is still analyzing the Code requirements but it may be necessary to have some technical waivers to accommodate that configuration. He said one of the discussion questions that was included in the report is whether potential Waivers are acceptable to accommodate private streets with public easements if the streets are designed and constructed to public standards.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has provided conceptual street sections showing a typical section for each of the roadway types. He said the section for John Shields Parkway and is consistent with the typical section that the City has developed, including two travel lanes, two parallel parking lanes with permeable pavers, a carriage walk to provide access for passengers leaving cars and a cycle track located just behind the carriage walk at the same grade as the side walk behind the curb. He said there will be a five

foot tree planter area that will not necessarily be a tree lawn but there would be sidewalk connections moving through this between the parking lane and a six foot sidewalk. He said there is a 65 foot public access easement for the two north south streets proposed, aside from it being a public access easement this section is also consistent with a typical section that the City has developed for a typical neighborhood street in the Bridge Street District, and the only difference from the John Shields Parkway section is that this does not include a cycle track because it is a lower volume local street.

Mr. Goodwin said there is also a proposed east-west street in two separate segments separated by the proposed clubhouse. He said the original version of the plans that the ART reviewed did not include an east-west street and the ART recommended that one be included as a means to meet the block size requirements and improve connectivity. He said the applicant has responded with a site plan that has incorporated this street. He said Planning and Engineering had suggested this street be designed as a yield street because this is expected to be such a low volume, localized street. He said a yield street would have a narrower pavement section, with parking on both sides, very slow speeds, as often found in older residential neighborhoods, and when drivers approach from one way or the other, one has to decide to yield to the other to pass. He said this is not quite shown in the plan. He said it is two typical travel lanes and a parallel parking lane on one side of the street, with a 7.5 foot sidewalk with a tree grate. He said he noted in the report that Planning and Engineering still wanted to do some analysis of this proposed street section because it is not a typical street section that has been developed by the City and they are still working out how a typical yield street would be developed as well. However, they do have some concerns with the width of the sidewalk and the planting area and is something they want to work more with the applicant on.

Mr. Goodwin said another discussion point is whether the proposed street network provides an appropriate balance of pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular mobility throughout the site. He said the applicant has provided a proposed block plan showing the the required building zone for the apartment building types of 5 to 20 feet from the right-of-way. He said the building setbacks vary with some at the right-of-way and some at the rear of the RBZ. He said mid-block pedestrianways are provided throughout all of the blocks. He said the blocks along the west and south edges of the site are partial blocks, and the full block would actually be built with the extension of streets and adjacent re-development and this is a condition expected to happen at various locations in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Goodwin said blocks D and E on the east edge of the site do comply with the block length and size requirements of the Code, however these blocks have a temporary condition in which there would not actually be street frontage if that street was built with a future phase. He said Block C in the center of the site is partially bisected by McCune Avenue, which is divided by the clubhouse. He said the clubhouse would create a terminal vista at a proposed "T" intersection. That configuration would result in some potential waivers to be considered as this application moves forward, one to block length along the proposed Deardorff Street. exceeding the 500 foot block length and the overall perimeter of the block exceeds 1,750 foot perimeter. He said Block G on the south side of the site would also be a potential waiver to the maximum block to minimize vehicular interruptions to the greenway. He said the Bridge Street Code does include a number of exemptions to block size requirements including if there is an existing open space that wouldn't be desirable to break up with a street and that Planning has discussed potentially considering a future amendment to the Code that might include an exemption for planned open spaces such as a greenway corridor. He said another discussion question is whether potential Waivers to block size requirements are appropriate based on the proposed street system, greenway configuration, and clubhouse location.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has provided a conceptual open space plan that shows the greenway along John Shields Parkway that amounts to 1.2 acres and four pocket parks in a quad configuration in the center of the site associated with the clubhouse, each approximately .25 acre each. He said the minimum open space requirement for the 392 units is 1.8 acres and this plan meets the requirement. He said there a couple of smaller spaces shown as pocket parks but they do not meet the minimum

dimension and size requirements. He said another discussion question is whether the proposed open space plan provides for an appropriate distribution of publicly accessible open spaces.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has also provided conceptual architectural renderings for the proposed buildings. He noted the Commission's packet includes artistic renderings of the architecture and the open space throughout the development. He said there are 8-unit, 10-unit, 12-unit and 20-unit buildings and there are essentially two types of building configurations. He said the 10 and 20-unit buildings are designed with an at-grade shared entrance to the building and integrated balconies. He said the 8 and 12-unit buildings are designed with a walk up configuration to the entrance and an integrated masonry wall and planter area along the front façade. He said the architecture is modern emphasizing geometric forms. He said one of the major discussion points at the pre-application review with ART was a concern that there was not sufficient architectural diversity being proposed with the original proposal. He said the applicant has responded with an additional building model with a variation on the theme and the packet includes rendering of more versions showing some variations in materials and color. He said one of the discussion questions is whether the proposal illustrates an appropriate level of architectural diversity for a new residential neighborhood in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Goodwin said the proposed clubhouse is a one story building at a terminal vista at the "T" intersection. He said the terminal vista requirements do require more verticality than what is proposed and Planning would consider this to likely be a civic building type might also consider it an accessory structure to the larger development. He said if it were considered a civic building type there are a couple of requirements that may require waivers for building height and a building setback from the right-of-way. He said one of the discussion questions is whether potential Waivers to Civic Building Type requirements appropriate? He said more analysis is needed to determine how this building should be considered.

Aaron Underhill, Attorney, 8000 Walton Parkway, Suite 270, New Albany, said he is representing Casto. He said there are a number of issues to deal with along with economic development issues that they are working through with the City Administration in trying to get John Shields Parkway built and some conceptual drawings showing what could happen on the Byers site and on a piece of property under common ownership with the property being discussed tonight.

Mr. Underhill said they are looking for feedback from the Commission on the site plan and architecture. He said they have some contractual deadlines that are upcoming and have been working with staff for about four months to get the site plan and the architecture that they have made a lot of progress with and are meeting most of the standards of the Bridge Street Code. He said they have reached a well thought out plan. He said they are expected to come forward with a number of deviations driven by the location of Tuller Road that is not moving, the recommended location of John Shields Parkway which is incorporated into their plan along with the greenway. He said they have worked to meet the requirements of the Code with only limited exceptions. He said they have accomplished a number of recommendations of the Bridge Street Vision Plan including the gridded street pattern, the extension of John Shields Parkway and the construction of that with the City's assistance, the greenway corridor that extends from the river to Dublin Village Center, and are creating an upscale project that once Dublin Village Center redevelops will be located near a mix of uses that will be attractive to the people that will live here. He said one of the deviations they have requested is to have some of the streets within the network to be private streets with a public easement because the City of Columbus will not allow water lines to cross public streets without a serious cost of fees and taps costing 225,000 to 250,000 to install and if added with the gridded street system it adds up and harms the economic viability of the project. He said they are going to build the streets to public specifications, but will and the public will have full use of the streets as they would if they were public and platted. He said there is justification for deviation.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, said he appreciates the opportunity to talk about this project. He said it is consistent with the Dublin vision for the Bridge Street Corridor and they want to design housing that has an appropriate density and creates a sense of place with buildings fronting the streets and will be very attractive to the preferred market of young professionals. He said they were trying to come up with a concept that is very clean and contemporary, with high quality materials, including brick and hardie panels and siding with very clean details. He said the panels will have metal edges. He said they have two diagrammatic type buildings, with buildings with on grade access that are 100 percent accessible. He said they took the two major streets Tuller and John Shields where they are going to have the most traffic and came up with building diagrams where they didn't have any living right at the street levels for those segments.

Mr. Sullivan said there is a two story building with a half flight of stairs on the outside of the building which is like a brown stone walkup with an intermediate landing and then walk up a half flight to the first level of units. He said the main living is one floor above grade. He said they are technically a two bedroom unit but function as a one bedroom den unit with a built up planted area and has more of what is called foundation windows and doesn't feel as exposed to the public street. He said unit lives like a one unit flat and has a supplemental den in the lower level. He said from the stairway they have access to a garage behind. He said there are two units on each side of the stairway stacked with each having a garage. He said this is an attractive module of a building type that will respond very effectively to having a flat with an attached garage. He said this building type has 100 percent attached garage. He said the other building types have back to back units, a stairway interior and access the units from the interior stairway with garages at the first level on the rear. He said for this building type 60 percent of the units have access to a garage.

Mr. Sullivan said the clubhouse does meet the requirement for a story and a half at 16.5 feet to the roof level of the building being a tall space being inspired by the Barcelona Pavilion with a very contemporary feel and is a signature of the center of the space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there are discussion questions to be answered with several items to talk about with this application.

Ms. Newell asked about the tap fees and provisions with the private streets, how the streets would be maintained. She asked if they were told the streets had to be public streets what is the solution for them to build the property, and asked if they always have to have an additional tap fee.

Mr. Goodwin said according to the City of Columbus that is their requirement.

Ms. Newell asked if they did make a recommendation that they be private streets, how they would get maintained in the future.

Mr. Goodwin said it would be done through a maintenance agreement as part of a development agreement and that is something that they have discussed but still have to work out terms with the applicant.

Ms. Newell asked if the maintenance agreement was going to have the City maintaining the streets or that the owner will maintain the streets at public standards.

Mr. Goodwin said it has not yet been determined.

Ms. Newell said she really liked the presentation and the design of the building and the entry description and the way it is staged is creative and answers one of the things they are looking for in the Bridge Street Corridor with new development that is not the same thing that they have seen and appreciates the creativity. She said she likes the contemporary designs of the buildings but wondered whether it was too much of the same thing in the same area and doesn't know yet how she feels about that. She said she has a reservation as they move forward with the different buildings, that the first buildings constructed will have a tendency to set the architectural style for everything that comes down the road and is concerned at the mass of things and that there is a lot of repetitiveness to the elements within the building. She said she doesn't know if that is a bad thing, but is expressing something to consider as the development moves forward. She said the proposed streets did provide appropriate pedestrian and vehicle mobility and likes the profile that is coming down John Shields Parkway and how that street profile has progressed. She said she is okay with the potential waivers for the block size and knew that they looked at that once before and when she looked at the overall development and what is around it so she thought that the waivers were appropriate and didn't envision that every block that they are going to have is always going to fit within the grid. She thought having some variety between them is appropriate and was also appropriate to keep the connection with the greenway and is okay with the clubhouse at the "T" intersection. She said she liked the building and didn't think that it would overpower the greenspace and hoped that the greenspace would always have a very public feel to it. She said that even though it is a clubhouse and it would have the pool behind she wouldn't want other public that is not necessarily living in these properties to feel as though they were not invited to the greenspace. She said it is really important that every public space truly feel like they belong to the public and that is also going to create that traffic pattern from one area to another. She said they would stroll through this area if they felt comfortable walking down the streets and into the park and felt like it was a park that is an amenity to the community not just to the residents of the property here.

Ms. Newell said she would not call this a civic building because it is not a government building.

Mr. Budde said he was trying to recall the other project in this area and the number of units that was proposed. He said this is more units but is more in keeping with what they are trying to do with the vision of the Bridge Street Corridor Plan and really likes the project. He said while the other project was massive and did not do the blocks and streets as envisioned, this project does it almost 100 percent and agrees waivers would be appropriate and meets what is trying to be accomplished. He said his answer to all six feedback questions is yes.

Mr. Fishman said he worries about density and is concerned about parking and assumes that not all the residents are going to be single occupants and will be most likely couples.

Mr. Sullivan said the statistics are off the charts that this is a young professionals market with single occupancy. He said there may be some couples within this project but it will be a very small percentage and the project is weighted toward one bedrooms. He said they cannot impose the standard sized family with 2.5 kids to every housing type and he doesn't think that will be the case. He said there will be parking on the street and that is what they want to create an urban feel.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for the breakdown of units.

Mr. Sullivan said the one building type of 8 and 12 unit buildings are technically a 50/50 mix of one's and two's, but all the two's are really one bedroom dens, so they can arguably say 100 percent of them are one bedrooms. He said in the other building types they are roughly 25 percent two bedrooms. He said that shows them how heavily weighted it is to one bedroom types.

Mr. Goodwin said the on street parking is something they want to see used, if the on street parallel lanes are not used they have a potential impact of increased speeds because they have functionally wider

lanes, so they want to see some use of on street parking, but they applicant is also providing surface parking lots within the site as well.

Mr. Fishman said he worries about the density and asked if staff had the pictures that he requested.

Mr. Goodwin said they had spoken earlier in the day and Mr. Fishman suggested that Mr. Taylor might have some pictures, but they were unable to connect.

Mr. Taylor said he was out of the office and did not get the message.

Mr. Fishman said there is a similar development in Chicago and he is worried that like in Chicago parking will be a nightmare and had concerns about the architecture. He asked about sustainability and young professionals that would be able to walk to work and thought that would not be the case in Dublin.

Mr. Sullivan said they have a significant amount of young professionals that live downtown and commute to the suburbs and they want to live urban and they are creating an opportunity for those people to live in this community in an urban setting.

Mr. Fishman said because of the density the amount of cars that worries him and the waivers he cannot comment on because it is not worked out yet. He said this is not downtown and they need open space and less density. He asked about the quality of finishes on the inside of the buildings.

Mr. Sullivan said it will be condo specs.

Mr. Fishman said he thought it does meet the Bridge Street Corridor vision but he is worried about sustainability, parking and density.

Ms. Krumb asked if John Shields was wiping out the existing tree line.

Mr. Goodwin said a portion of the existing tree line is being incorporated into the greenway and some of it will be impacted by the location of the buildings but the plans show masses of trees being preserved and incorporated into the greenway.

Ms. Krumb said she still does not understand the purpose of the greenway.

Mr. Goodwin said it is for bike and pedestrian connection with a variety of different types of spaces. He said Parks and Open Space is working on a conceptual framework for different activity nodes and more naturalized areas throughout the entire length of this greenway.

Mr. Krumb asked if it would be more like a multiuse path.

Mr. Goodwin said it would likely include a multiuse path going through the greenway in addition to the cycle track along John Shields to provide an alternative, more recreational route.

Ms. Krumb asked if the undergrowth will be cleared if some of the trees are preserved.

Mr. Goodwin said a lot of analysis still needs to be done and the applicant will need to complete a tree survey, but the undergrowth would typically be cleared out and more formalized.

Ms. Krumb said the buildings to the south of the greenway seem to be drastically separated from the rest of the area and maybe the plans for the park will help.

Mr. Goodwin said the Code does anticipate this type of situation in some cases and they would like to treat open spaces like this like a street, so the building has to front the open space in the same way with a pedestrian walkway along the edge of the open space so it is still public realm in the same way the street is public realm. He agreed it is a very different look and feel then what would be with the building up to the street.

Ms. Krumb asked if the road that runs behind the buildings is considered an alley.

Mr. Goodwin said it would function like an alley or private drive.

Ms. Krumb said it does have a connection to the east but does not connect to the existing neighborhood to the south, but for the most part she thought they were connecting appropriately. She said she would like to see more information on the greenway. She said she is fine with the waiver to get around the legal language for the water taps as long as the city standards are maintained. She said the waiver for the block size is a tough one because they have a blank slate to work with. She said 580 feet is not a big difference and gets the argument of making the club house a focal point of the street. She said she thinks there is enough open space as long as they do not fence it off. She said she likes the architecture but does not want to see thirty buildings with the same architecture. She said she understands the use of other materials, but the overall footprint, height and massing is very similar and she would like to see more detail and variation.

Ms. Krumb said they needed to add diversity in the buildings. She said the clubhouse is not a civic building and she is fine with the building type but the height needs to be more appropriate to the surrounding buildings. She said she did some quick math on the parking with 444 parking spots in the whole development with 392 units seems really low and she is concerned where guests will park. She said she would like to have an explanation of how they are going to support guests, the occasional events at the club house and various parking situations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked how many parking spaces will there be total.

Mr. Goodwin said to meet the minimum parking requirement it would be 460 spaces and they are providing 466 spaces throughout the entire site including on street.

Mr. Underhill said the tone and the vision of the Code is to encourage pedestrian activity and to come in with a big parking lot would be a mistake and they will look to see if there is more opportunity to provide more public on street parking.

Mr. Hardt said when this packet landed on his porch he thought it was a pleasant surprise and this goes a long way toward achieving what they were trying to get when the Bridge Street Corridor was conceived and put together. He said it is not perfect and still there is work to do, but it definitely is on the right track. He said he does not have a problem with the parking or density because they spent two years looking at examples of dense urban environments such as Boston and Arlington Virginia and saying that is what they want and finds it disconcerting that now that it is in front of them they might chicken out. He said this is what the Bridge Street Corridor was conceived to bring and he thought they have to hold the course and let it play out.

Mr. Hardt said the street network is fine, the potential waivers for the public streets if determined by Engineering and Legal that it is the best way to do them he is okay because at the end of the day the public is not going to know or care what legal documents say who owns the street as long as it is done properly. He said the block sizes are being determined by what is there and Tuller Road is built and John Shields Parkway has to be there, so the block size is the block size and the whole point of waivers was for exactly situations like this. He said the open space is okay, and he agrees with Ms. Newell's comments and doesn't see the clubhouse as a civic building. He said in his mind a civic building is a publicly

assessable building that provides public services, which this is not it. He said he would like to see the building have some kind of architectural feature where the street terminates but it doesn't have to be a tower or something taller, just visually interesting. He said McCune Avenue is too humble of a street to have a tower at the end of it and thought the Code meant that for major public spaces. He said he likes the contemporary architecture and that they are getting creative design and different styles of living units and that they are getting away from fake old and instead look like buildings of their time. He said he is concerned with potential that it looks a little too much like an apartment complex and not enough like a neighborhood and that can be addressed with a little bit of variety, with options of different brick colors and maybe the answer is all the options, but he is concerned a little bit about the diversity.

Mr. Hardt said a couple big picture issues are the road sections and he is frustrated that there was a developer at the east of John Shields that said they didn't want cycletracks in front of their businesses because they thought it would be detrimental and there is another developer beginning the process at the west end proposing a street section and now a developer in the middle proposing a street section.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant is proposing what staff told them they needed for John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Hardt said that was good and that Engineering and Planning needed to decide what John Shields Parkway should be from end to end and have it be the end of the discussion.

Mr. Hardt said hopefully some day there will be redevelopment at Dublin Village Center with and there is also a proposal for the west end down by the river that will have some commercial, but there will be a whole bunch of residential in the middle and no compelling reason to walk between the two of them unless you happen to live there. He said he would love a proposal like this to include some provisions for future commercial components such as the option along John Shields Parkway of squeezing in a coffee shop or mixed use.

Mr. Taylor said when he saw they were going to have a 392 unit apartment complex he imagined the worst and what was in the packet was far better than that and generally speaking he likes where they are headed with this project. He said he likes the architecture of the buildings but has concerns with variety. He said they need to stay where they are with style and form and thought buildings should represent their actual period styles. He said the packet was a great example of how interesting a hand rendering can be and how boring a CAD drawing can be. He said there is a lot of texture in all of the elements except for the large hardie panels and was concerned they go from a fine texture to a large scale texture very quickly and wondered if there is some way to get a finer grain to avoid such stark contrast.

Mr. Taylor said he enjoyed what was said about the layout of the buildings and appreciates how passionate Mr. Sullivan talks about the design. He said he thanked whoever was responsible for the context plan. He said the architecture of the buildings is great. He said he is not sure the arrangement of the buildings is defining the neighborhood correctly. He said they need to take a look at what a neighborhood needs to be and thinks the greenway is odd and doesn't work, and it would be better if they rotated the interior greenspace 90 degrees clockwise and pushed it down to John Shields Parkway they would accomplish a lot of good things. He said they would make the park publicly accessible and give the clubhouse a more prominent position. He said that would tie them together. He suggested they should design some buildings to have an option of future retail space such as general store or barbershop etc. serving a very large number of residents.

Mr. Taylor said the parking should be designed for just not quite enough parking and the idea is they want young couples to own one car and not two and if they work close by it's all the better. He said that to deal with parking on the street the City may need a parking authority or metering along the streets.

Mr. Taylor said if they rotate the center of the development around they can deal with McCune Avenue and it would not be a dead end any more. He said they might be meeting the requirements of the Bridge Street District, but just technically, but are not meeting the real spirit of it or the planning goals. He said parts are good, but it is still an isolated development and what is really going to work is when they connect everything together. He said they need to find a way to open it up to the street somehow, with its own identity but with the open space on the public side. He also asked where air conditioners were going to be located.

Mr. Sullivan said they will be on the roof and he is not a fan of ground mounted or PTAC units for a lot of reasons. He said for areas of high density those do not contribute to the quality of the public space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she has two buckets of thoughts and one is about the district as a whole and what the consultants have told them and all the documents they have produced to date. She said it was an extensive and exhaustive process and they came back with a series of reports and page 19 of the Bridge Street Corridor Study says there is market opportunity for approximately 1500 housing units over the next 5 to 7 years, and they could be absorbed at a rate 223 per year. She said the vision report for the Tuller Greenway District talks about residential units at about 1,250 square feet and having the capacity for 550 of them in the Tuller/Greenway district. She said it is a sizable district and although she is not a land use or urban planner, they paid a lot of money to hire the consultants and this is the information they provided.

Mr. Goodwin said that staff still owes the Commission a summary of the more recent information about how much development has been planned for.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she asked some Council members if their thinking of the district was different and the answer across the board was no and there is a project before them with 392 units on 17 acres and they just heard a case that had 360 units on a 120 acres and they cut them off of development until the proper infrastructure was built. She said she is not a transportation authority, but wonders how they originally felt like the maximum of this roadway connectivity pattern could support 1,500 units district-wide in all 8 districts of the Bridge Street Corridor, how they can now come to terms with nearly 800 units on 44 acres. She said they have of the 1,500 units that the consultants said was available within the district and they do not have a square inch of commercial or other services and she will not support any application until those questions were answered. She said she would like to see traffic studies and knows that people complain on a daily basis of the intersection of Tuller Road and Riverside Drive. She said there is one way east and west out of this place and it is State Route 161, and there is essentially one way north and south and that is Riverside Drive. She said they can put in a grid network system but when it dead-ends at the river and sawmill road and I-270 and along 161 it is not going to work.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said until that problem has been solved she will not support any application of this magnitude. She said it is not a reflection of the application and the parking is far more creative and done exceedingly better but is not all that different than sycamore ridge. She said there is a bunch of apartment complexes, with greenspace in the middle, and paths, but it is really not urban because it is not mixed use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are getting so far out of balance and they have to be encouraging and creating applications that come in with some form of balance where there are services and other things that can happen here. She said she has been reading in the paper lately of people wanting to leave Polaris because of the traffic problems and they have a similar situation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wants them to enter into this with firm convictions that they are not creating those kinds of scenarios and when they bring in applications that are so far out of balance that they have all the residential units and nothing commercial with it, it will create problems with them and

she believes every application that comes before this commission in this district should be mixed use in and of itself. She said otherwise they will be out of balance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were more questions.

Mr. Sullivan said no.

**2. Avondale Woods – Avery Road
12-084Z/PDP/PP**

**Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Preliminary Plat**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said following application is for a new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road. She said this is a request for a recommendation to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan and also a request for approval of a preliminary plat.

Claudia Husak presented this application She said this is the first time the Commission is reviewing a rezoning application for this site. She said the previous reviews have been for concept plans by this applicant in February of 2011 where the comments were focused on architectural concept and a review of proposed layout and use of the site in September of 2010. She said this is a rezoning from the Rural District to a Planned Unit Development District and includes 120 acres and the rezoning would establish a planned district with regulations specific to this site.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site is the very southern tip of the City of Dublin surrounded by the City of Columbus, next to the CSX railroad line and in the City of Hilliard School District. She said there is a number of major future roadway projects that are going to take place, south is the Hayden Run Boulevard extension and to the north out of the Community Plan is the future extension of Tuttle Crossing. She said to the north is the Ponderosa Development and had gotten quite a few inquiries about the application including that piece and for the record that it does not include the Ponderosa Development.

Ms. Husak said this site will share an access off Avery Road with National Church Residences and Avondale Woods Boulevard has been constructed to this site.

Ms. Husak said there are seven subareas proposed for this site. She said the proposal is a mix of multi-family as well as single family residential units with open spaces and the woods to be preserved. She said there was a lot of analysis in the Planning Report that they talked about at the concept plan about the Community Plan and the Southwest Area Plan and there is a lot of discussion about having residential product in this area that is inclusive and has different options and choices, so the applicant is meeting the intent of those documents.

Ms. Husak said they are proposing two stub roads going to the west and to the north that are not going to any other development taking place on either boundaries of the site. She said the open spaces of Avondale Woods as well as the triangle woods area are to be preserved as such. She said Avondale Woods Boulevard is terminating into a center green space which is shared by the single family residences as well as multi-family residents. She said that a club house with a pool and stormwater management pond also to be shared by the entire neighborhood which makes this a more inclusive development is proposed along the eastern boundary.

Ms. Husak said Subarea A is just north of Avondale Woods Boulevard and shown as an attached product with two units within a building and the development text has a maximum of 48 units and is exactly what is shown on the plan with 24 two unit buildings. She said there is a one-acre open space included. She said the text describes these units as being double fronted where they are fronting onto the main street

or the open space and designed in a manner that does not showcase that there is a rear to the building which a private interior road function like a service road or an alley and the units have sidewalks from the front or rear to the interior walkway that loops around the entire area.

Ms. Husak said Subarea B is the area of most concern to Planning, mostly because of the location and the outside influences to the area and the design. She said it is 19 acres and the development text permits a maximum of 132 units, the total for the development is 360 which is the maximum density of the Community Plan which is 3 units to the acre. She said there are 4, 3 and 2 unit buildings proposed and there are some units fronting along the 2 acre green space and all have sidewalks to the walkway around the green space. She said that the bikepath will be incorporated along the railroad line as stated in the concept plan.

Ms. Husak said along the south side is the planned Columbus extension of Hayden Run Boulevard and she mentioned that Planning asked the applicant to put together some perspective drawings because the road is essentially designed and they wanted to show the Commission some of things they are concerned with. She said the applicant has increased the setback along the south property line to 100 feet and at the edge of the setback about 10 feet away there is a proposal to build an MSE (Mechanically Stabilized Earth) wall that goes 20 feet into the air with a slope that goes farther with the road sitting even higher on top of the wall and slope. She said looking at the wall the view would be the wall with cars on top of it and there is not any screening or buffering requirements being included in the development text and the concern is the view and feel of the residents experience and would much prefer road frontage and units neither back up or front along that property boundary.

Ms. Husak said the western boundary of Subarea B backs up to the railroad tracks and previously there was a 50 feet setback proposed and the applicant has increased it to 100 feet and CSX has requested a 200 feet setback at minimum. She said there are 16 trains traveling that line and is a fairly busy line and does not include the count of trains that carry coal, but there are coal carrying trains that utilize this line with 5 trains indicated to be traveling during night time hours.

Mr. Hardt asked why CSX requested 200 feet setback. Ms. Husak said it was a standard request without explanation.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has tried to pull the units back and there is a buffer for this boundary and it is proposed as a six-foot mound with evergreens and deciduous trees as well as a six-foot tall fence that is on top of the mound. She said there are still a substantial number of residential units backing up closely to the rail line and using the units to buffer the sound for the remainder of the units seems not to be providing for a quality of life that would hope they could get. She said having the road frontage and these units pulled in more is something asked of the applicant to look at.

Ms. Husak said they are concerned with the design of the private streets within this development, the streets do not have curb or gutters and where there are sidewalks they are only on one side of the street and interrupted a lot by the driveways with a small tree lawn proposed along the ending of the asphalt and would be a lot of driving over the fairly skinny tree lawn. She said overall they are concerned with the pedestrian character or lack thereof within this subarea as well as the safety and the view of garages is not something the land use principles have envisioned with multi-generational and varying types of residential development.

Ms. Husak said Subarea C is the single-family area in the center of the development proposed for 78 detached homes with 8 fronting onto the central green, the applicant is requiring side loaded garages for those to have more pedestrian environment within the area. She said there are some fairly narrow 55-foot lots on the west boundary and no lot size requirement and 55 is the minimum lot width and some areas where lots are wider. She said the applicant is proposing a minimum front setback as well as a maximum front setback, but the text is unclear as to what the requirement actually is between the

minimum and the maximum as well as the preliminary plat that accompanies this application does not show those requirements correctly. She said there are no rear yard setback requirements except the lots backing up to the park and there is a 20-foot tree preservation zone, but the text does not include a definition of that zone and makes provisions for utilities being allowed within that zone and making tree preservation challenging. She said there is a path included that would allow access to the park between two of the lots and has some concerns with lot 53 with all the easements causing the buildable area to be a small rectangle shape and would be separated from all the other lots and it creates isolated open space and is an awkward layout of the lot.

Ms. Husak said there are some provisions in the development text to delineate where the lots end and the woods start because there are concerns of encroachment and the provision of a proposed fence is not supported because it does not help with tree preservation.

Ms. Husak said Subarea D is the northeast portion of the site adjacent to a multi-family development that was zoned in the City of Columbus with 10 to 12 units to the acre. She said the applicant is allowing for a maximum density of 102 dwelling units and shown on the plan are 72 in the four-unit buildings and the applicant is not certain how this area may layout and maybe one of the areas that comes last as the phasing progresses through the site. She said they are supportive with the way it lays out with the streets functioning as alleys including on-street parking spaces and how the units are fronting the public street having sidewalks to the public streets. She said the subarea includes an emergency access point for fire and EMS services through the development that will take place within the City of Columbus but needs to be analyzed further by Washington Township. She said they have asked the applicant to do some traffic calming measures along the public street to be named Scarlet Lane because it is long and straight and encourages speeding. She said there are some notes on the plan that says there will be traffic calming, but they need to have a commitment as to what those measures would be and reviewed by Engineering.

Ms. Husak said the architecture and building materials are required through the development text and the Commission would see final detailed architecture for the multi-family within the development but would not see the architecture for the single family residential. She said the influences throughout the neighborhood are intended to be craftsman with those types of details and highlighted in the development text intended to provide a unified element through the development for architecture and vinyl siding is still listed as an option as a permitted material even though there is a requirement built in that the Commission has to approve it at the final development plan. She said they have been concerned about vinyl being on the list and cannot support this material to warrant maximum density permitted and does not create the characteristics and the design that is preferred for this development within Dublin.

Ms. Husak said Subarea E is the club house and the stormwater pond and is 11 acres of open space and the club house includes a pool and a parking lot. She said the applicant had moved it to this area of the development based on the recommendations by the Commission and is intended to serve the entire neighborhood.

Ms. Husak said the last two Subareas F and G are the Avondale Woods almost 30 acres of preserved woodlands and almost 5 acres in the triangle woods.

Tina Wawszkiewicz said there are some offsite improvements that have been discussed with the applicant and at varied degrees of agreement for the applicant to contribute. She said the first requirement is to install a traffic signal at the intersection that already exists with Avondale Woods Boulevard and Avery Road, connect the north south street to the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with a gap between the parcel line and where they anticipate that new roadway to fall, and for the applicant to fund a two lane roadway from Avery to the access point at the north end of their site, contribute to a larger project that the City of Dublin is just starting to design which is the widening of Avery Road and the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard from the east to Avery Road which includes two roundabouts at

that intersection of Avery and Tuttle and a round-about at the southern intersection of Rings Road and Avery Road at a total project cost of 11 million in the current estimate. She said the last contribution request for improvements is related to a limitation of development coming from a Franklin County request where they maintain the intersection of Hayden Road and Avery Road on the other side of the railroad tracks and they are at capacity so their request is to cap the development until the more regional connections like Hayden Run Boulevard and Tuttle come over to Avery so there is a reliever on that at the existing Hayden Run Road.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the applicant has agreed to install the traffic signal at the intersection of Avery Road and Avondale Woods Boulevard except the right-of-way is owned and maintained by the City of Columbus, so there needs to be a partner with the project because there will be some significant delay getting in and out of the side street where there is a stop sign control because of the volumes on Avery Road, however there is not enough volume initially to warrant the traffic signal under the under the Federal requirements, so Columbus may not allow that signal to go in until this development is much further along than they would like to see it go in at and if this is a favorable response they would work with Columbus to try and get that traffic signal installed earlier. She said if that does not happen, the site needs an additional way out because there will be a lot of delay at that intersection and would require the connection up to the extended Tuttle and the access point over to Avery Road sooner with that scenario and the applicant has agreed to closing the gap.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the request for the applicant to fund a two lane standard section roadway with pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the proposal is to actually build what they would see in the Community Plan which is a four lane divided much like Emerald Parkway, and they would fund the two lane portion into that larger project and the City of Dublin would lead that project, which they have not yet come to terms.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the applicant has agreed to the contribution of the widening of Avery Road and the Tuttle extension to this point and over to the east at that intersection. She said their site contribution would be proportional to the amount of site traffic utilizing the improvements at 4.5%. She said they have agreed to cap their development as requested by Franklin County at 185 units until the Hayden Run Boulevard connection or the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension can carry traffic between Avery Road and I-270.

Ms. Husak said based on concerns with Subarea B and others highlighted in the presentation and Planning Report, as well as the Engineering concerns, they are not in a position to recommend approval of this application, so the recommendation is disapproval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Preliminary Plat that accompanies the application.

Chris Cline, with Blaugrund & Herbert, 300 W. Wilson Bridge Road, said they have Linda Menerey with EMH&T and Jim Lipnos, President of Homewood are present. He said since they were last before the Commission in 2012 they have met continuously with staff and done 5 complete submittals which is a very expensive and detailed process. He said this project has been continuously worked on by the applicant and by staff. He said this is envisioned as a multi-generational residential project which is pedestrian oriented and walkability has been at the forefront of the project goals. He said the key element to the architecture is the attached residential with different floor plans that are not apartments or townhomes, they are single-family floor plans that are attached with an open concept just like houses that are attached and these are not like apartments where there will be people cycling in and out like there would be in typical townhomes, they would envision a family to move in and stay and not consider it to be temporary renters and that people will be able to move within the different aspects of this community. He said the architecture, the layout and the interior quality all will help achieve those goals. He said the quality of the tenants and the longevity of the tenants, the renters and the ultimate quality of a multi-family project depends on what is inside and if they enjoy living there and living there over time. He said they meet the Community Plan and the Area Plan.

Mr. Cline said vinyl is not a primary material, the permitted materials are brick, stone, synthetic stone, wood and fiber cement siding. He said P.V.C. and vinyl are on the discretionary portion and if they propose the use during the final development plan they may want to use as the best option in a shake type product, he said this is not a vinyl project, but they request the option to bring back for approval.

Mr. Cline said roadway contributions have been committed with a significant amount of money. He said this development cannot bare that expense of the Tuttle Crossing extension. He said they would be able to do 126 units within Subareas A and C until Columbus builds 5 lanes along Avery or the Tuttle Crossing extension to the north.

Mr. Cline said there is a fire emergency access to the north and they have agreed with the Fire Marshal to build at their standards. He said that architecture every residential subarea requires a front porch, front walk with a public sidewalk, the private walk or the driveway.

Mr. Cline described the architectural elements focusing on the garage door requirements stipulated in the proposed development text. He said the biggest influences to this development is the railroad and he showed examples of setbacks through area residential communities, such as Linworth Village with 50 feet setbacks. He said if it is a nice community people are willing to live there. He said Hayden Run Boulevard with the elevated roadway, from a development perspective it is a positive and will not be affected except for the wall and will not inhibit the renting of the units or the long term value of the project.

Mr. Cline said they believe Subarea B is well done with similar driveways that cross a sidewalk as found throughout Dublin, as well as a bikepath system that connects the entire area.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said Subarea B has 132 units and showed a drawing showing green spaces that are disbursed throughout the site. She said Lot 58 is Subarea C has a lot of easements on it and is a big lot that has a sanitary and storm line that goes through it creating a development situation that serves the rest of the site but limits this lot but the buildable area is bigger than the other lots and it is odd and it is out there by itself but it is a buildable lot. She said they did increase the setbacks within Subarea B and have sound proofing incorporated and the landscape along Hayden Run will be augmented. She said they have deferred parking and other items such as driveways to the Final Development Plan. She said they are working through the issues outlined in the Planning Report with regard to the development text and wanted to get feedback from the Commission and move this project forward.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any one from the general public to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Fishman said the Community Plan is laid out as a suggestion for what things should be and it stresses him when there is a development being proposed at the maximum density. He said the railroad is requesting a 200-foot setback because the trains that carry coal and the dust gets on the houses. He said when you build along a track you have to build something creative and it should appear like the rest of Dublin. He said the housing should be away from the railroad tracks, and he thought the open spaces are great and is wonderful to have walkable community as long as there they have a place to go. He said if they are asking for the maximum density it has to be creative to get them to vote for the proposal. He said one car garages in his experience is not appropriate for couples and homes must provide two car garages to avoid having a car parked outside because it is not great visually to have cars sitting around.

Mr. Budde said they had looked at this development in the past and this plan is an improvement over the last and he recognizes that this is a difficult site with the railroad, the extension of Hayden Run and it is disconcerting that the staff analysis continues to say criteria not met and it is very difficult for him to support the application as it is proposed.

Ms. Newell said the elevated roadways are not very attractive and there are a number of properties had a beautiful view until the roadway was constructed to go over railroad tracks and is concerned with how they are going to deal with the roadway in the future. She said they are building too close to appropriated landscape or come up with a nice amenity. She said she is bothered by the railroad track and asked what are the bases for the 200-foot setback request. She said when living near a railroad you get used to the noise and with the STC ratings of walls up to 50 and with her experience she uses 60 rating between classrooms to minimize noise from one room to the other and wanted an explanation to how they are coming up with 50.

Mr. Cline said this is new to them and 50 STC is their starting point and if there is a suggestion for a higher rating they could condition the requirement.

Ms. Newell said she is bothered by the continual straight line that is repeated on the site plan and knows it is because of the railroad track and the bikepath equally running parallel and if there was less density on the site they could do something creative with the bikepath and create a better landscape buffer. She said she envisions every driveway will be filled with cars and that is all the residents will be looking at and she does not see this plan being focused on foot traffic. She said the applicant has said they have things to yet work out as the staff report says the same thing, she is not prepared to support this application.

Ms. Krumb said she is surprised to see a disapproval recommendation because this has been in twice and the proposal is similar to the last version. She said because the conditions are not written out she could not approve this application today. She said they are not that far away from an approval and the biggest issue is outside influences and the transportation stuff will work itself out and the agreements have to be made with Engineering and is not for the Planning Commission to decide. She said she would like more detail on the phasing and she does not have a big issue with the railroad track or the concrete wall. She said they have done a good job with the bikepaths, but she has concerns related to the access.

Mr. Hardt said he was surprised from the overall recommendation of staff as they had seen this a few times and they made comments and this proposal is largely in line with the last informal review and he is appreciative of the changes made and he does not have objections to the proposal. He said he is concerned with detail issues that need to be worked and he cannot yet vote. He asked about the status of the quiet zone efforts.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said they requested preliminary engineering at Cosgray in 2010 from CSX and just recently received that on that one crossing. She said the zone was related to 5 crossing and they only control 1 of those at Cosgray Road with this rail line. She said they need to complete 2 crossings for Franklin County in that same capacity and they have yet to receive theirs.

Mr. Hardt said they horns will continue.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said it will take a while and funding to get measures into place with the rail and the Federal Rail Association to get the approval and actually stop the horns.

Mr. Hammersmith said in the capital improvements it has yet to be funded and it will be waiting for the state capital funds and corporation from other jurisdictions to make this happen and it is unlikely it would move forward any time soon.

Mr. Hardt said he sees a couple shapes for the pond and assumes that the image on the plat is what is being proposed and encouraged that version. He said he would want all the engineering issues addressed and with regards to Lot 58 if the house were to be turned sideways to be facing north he would be concerned. He said he is concerned with the long straight road and if they are building a road with traffic calming on day one it should be designed better with curves or with no problems in the beginning. He said in Subarea E he would like provisions made for a future connection to the east for future

development and he feels it is important that all residential developments are connected. He said there seems to be a lot of right-of-way issues and engineering issues of thing to be worked out and if wrapped up and resolved then he could support the overall project.

Mr. Taylor said this plan is essentially the same as 2 years ago and he is fine with the overall layout of the project. He said there are a lot of details that are suggested and this is a step in the right direction. He said most of the technical issues are with engineering. He said in some ways this plan is more walkable with several green spaces and a lot of density which is part of being walkable and a passive park in the center of the community and thought the next step is that the applicant work on the issues with Engineering and come back with a list of conditions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agrees with what has been said and does not have a problem with the application and thought there is a significant amount of work to do and she is concerned with Subarea B and could not support any application without curb and gutters on streets. She is concerned with the fairly narrow streets and no on-street parking and would like to see some parking centrally located to serve Subarea B for the visitors of the residents. She said she is concerned with lot layout with the small lots being back to back and she thought they should be off-set and configured some other way with some staggering. She said the landscape details and the plan need to be to scale and significant landscape plans with details of trees pits and tree wells, labeled trees and make sure to create livable environments. She said the vinyl is being proposed as an option and she would like to close the door so there is no surprises down the road. She said she appreciates the response to their comments and connectivity throughout the community with sidewalks on one side of the road is not bothersome and within her neighborhood there are no sidewalks and only walking trails and serves them well. She said she would like to know why there was a change in the CSX thinking on the setbacks. She said she could support the application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant what they would like to see happen with this application.

Mr. Cline requested a tabling.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to table the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes called for a brief break at 9:15 p.m.

3. Perimeter Center PCD, Subarea C - Noah's Special Events Center 5555 Wall Street 13-099Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is an application for a 10,000-square-foot, one-story building on a 3-acre site within Subarea C of the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, located on the east side of Wall Street north of Perimeter Drive. She said this is a request for a recommendation to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan and of a preliminary plat and the Commissioners are required to make two motions; both applications will be forwarded to City Council from the Commission.

Mr. Goodwin presented this application and said this site is located in the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District and is located along Wall Street north of Perimeter Drive. He said the RC Olmstead Office Building is located immediately to the north of this site and the Village of Coffman Park residential neighborhood currently under development is located to the northeast and generally this area is primarily office area.

Mr. Goodwin showed the existing subareas of the Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District stating that this site is located in Subarea C. He said the applicant is proposing to create a new Subarea C2 specifically for a 2.5-acre site currently within Subarea C and has provided a development plan that will go along with the proposed development text. He said the proposed development text would add conference centers and a multi-purpose events center use to a list of permitted uses in the existing Subarea C, currently Subarea C includes a list of specific uses and references the suburban office and institutional zoning district and the office laboratory research zoning district, so there are a wide variety of uses that are permitted in this area, but they are primarily office oriented.

Mr. Goodwin said the Community Plan highlights this area as a standard office and institutional area, the plan describes that land use classification as encouraging other types of business support uses, not necessarily just office uses, ideally those would be integrated with an office building, such as a restaurant use or a day care that would serve the daytime employee population in those areas. He said the applicants proposed text adds a multi-purpose events center and provides a definition in the text described as a facility to allow for business meeting space, educational workshops and seminars, family and/or corporate parties, weddings and/or receptions. He said this is proposed specifically to allow for a business called Noah's that has facilities throughout the country and he showed a slide of other Noah locations elsewhere in the country focusing on providing this multi-purpose event type of facility and the intended facility is designed to be flexible so that people can use different rooms in different ways whether it is for a business meeting or small conference or a wedding with associated reception. He said there would be kitchen with this facility with catering, so there will no actual food prep on site.

Mr. Goodwin said the site would be subdivided from the RC Olmstead office building to the north at 5555 Wall Street showing 22 existing parking spaces that serve the existing office building that are actually on the proposed site. He said a number of years ago there was an intent by the owner of this office building to build an additional phase that never happened which is why the parking was configured in this way. He said if this proposal were to be approved that existing parking lot and associated landscaping would need to be relocated closer to the existing office building and done through a separate amended final development plan.

Mr. Goodwin said the building is proposed to be located at the rear of the lot with an associated enclosed patio space at the rear of the building main entrances would be located on the north and south sides of the building with secondary entrances on the front of the building with a parking field of 83 spaces in front of the building with a dumpster located at the front of the parking lot. He said a stormwater pond is located in front of the parking along the Wall Street frontage. He said the applicant is also proposing a shared access drive stubbing to the currently vacant south property at the corner of Wall Street and Perimeter Drive. He said this proposal would also transfer a 24 foot wide strip from the property to the south to this property.

Mr. Goodwin said the proposed development text modifies some of the existing development standards in Subarea C of the Perimeter Center text, the parking pavement setbacks which are 25 feet from side property lines, the proposed text narrows these to 15 feet and the parking shown in the plan is designed with a 15-foot setback from the north and south property lines. He said the building itself is setback much farther than the 25 foot standard in the existing text and the applicant is providing a continuous walkway from Wall Street with a public side walk through the side along the south edge of the parking lot that would encroach the pavement setback.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant is proposing a specific parking ratio in the development text for the multi-purpose event center use at 8 spaces per 1,000 square feet and also in the report included is a parking study that was conducted for some other existing Noah's facilities elsewhere in the country and found there are three of the five facilities are of similar size to the proposed Dublin facility between 11 to 12,500 square feet, the proposed facility is 10,200 square feet. He said each of the facilities have at least

an existing parking ratio of 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet and the applicant looked at high capacity of events that occurred over a number of months there were a small number of events between 2 to 5 percent of observed events that exceeded what would be 8 per 1,000 square foot parking ratio which is the proposed parking ratio. He said in those events the information provided showed an over capacity event occurred that the number of parking demand exceeded the 8 per 1,000 ratio by 40 to 50 percent of spaces. He said this is a concern that Planning has that not enough parking is being provided with the proposed plan with this type of use.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has provided conceptual architectural elevations for the proposed facility and generally Planning finds the proposed architecture of high quality with a high amount of detailing on most of the facades soldier coursing, corbeling use of side-light windows and transom windows, the building has an ace, middle and top, however although the proposed development text notes that four-sided architecture is required the east elevation the front elevation which faces Wall Street is lacking in the detail particularly the window transparency that is found on the other elevations, there are three doors provided on this elevation that would have windows within the doors but the proposed landscape plan shows that even these doors would be screened from view and the intent seems to be to screen the entire façade from view. He said there is six faux "bricked in" windows on this façade, rather than actual windows and Planning is concerned that essentially the rear or service side of this building is being presented to the public right-of-way. He said by contrast the west elevation facing the rear of the site provides a much higher level of window transparency, this is associated with an internal ball room and the exterior patio space that would provide a reception function associated with the ball room. He said the north and south elevations which face the sides of the proposed site function as dual fronts and mirrors to each and provides a main entrance with associated pergola feature and Planning feels that it would be more appropriate for one of these facades to actually face the public street.

Mr. Goodwin said the concerns are with the location of the building on the site and the orientation that the building faces, the building is setback approximately 300 feet from Wall Street inconsistent with other buildings in the area and as development occurs to the south this will create a visual gap along Wall Street. He said it is not uncommon to see a parking field in front of the building, however it is not typically the entire field of parking in front of the building and there are buildings such as the building next door that a landscape feature between the street and building and parking to the side or rear and there is still an architectural presences of this building as seen from the public way. He showed existing buildings in the area and highlighted parking, entrances and building presence to the street.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant has provided a proposed preliminary plat that would subdivide the existing RC Olmstead office site to create the new tract 2 and also transfer a strip land from tract 1 an approximately a 5 acre site at the corner of Perimeter Drive and Wall Street. He said Planning is concerned with this because that site is seen as a significant or key office building site and concerned transferring that land from that site would reduce parking capacity what could be a larger office building at that site and thus reduce development potential on that site for a non-office use in this area.

Mr. Goodwin said they have provided an analysis of the review criteria for rezoning and preliminary development plan in the planning report and a few items to note, a couple criteria do not apply to this proposal, there are only two that planning feels have been met and they deal with provision of existing public services. He said the proposed text alters basic development standards of Subarea C and Planning does not feel that is appropriate. He said the proposed use is a concern because it will focus on social functions and night and evening functions. He said applicant has said that business usually serves a 50/50 mix of corporate use and social gatherings, they are concerned that they will be heavily weighted towards social gatherings to create noise on nights and weekends that will affect the nearby residential neighborhood because they are concerned about parking and that there could be overflow parking that would affect Wall Street and there has not been a provision for a shared parking arrangement or deferred parking with any of the adjacent office users that could create an issue with the adjacent office sites as well.

Mr. Goodwin said they have concerns with the use as well as the site. He said the plan has not proposed contribution to future transportation improvements that are noted in the traffic impact study, those are not needed today, but they will be needed in the future and that would be handled through a development agreement with the City. He said the applicant has provided a storm water management report, however the report notes that the proposed storm water facility does not meet the City of Dublin requirements for storm water release rates and the report requests an exemption to those requirements, Engineering in not in favor of that.

Mr. Goodwin said the site design, the building placement and orientation of the building, the direction for which it faces is not consistent with the surrounding development pattern, and the parking is not adequately accommodated as noted earlier, the street facing façade does not meet Dublin's expectations for four sided architecture and is not consistent with that requirement in the proposed text. He said Planning's concern is that use is likely to create noise, traffic, parking effects for surrounding residents and businesses. He said the potential benefits for this type of business may have for Dublin and they do feel it would provide benefits somewhere in Dublin, but it is felt in this location as proposed the benefits do not outweigh the potential negative effects.

Mr. Goodwin said there are a number of specific content requirements in the Subdivision Regulations for a proposed plat that have not been included on the plat, but could be handled prior to Council if this proposal were to move forward with a positive recommendation from the Commission, but because Planning is not recommending approval of the proposed rezoning, they also recommend disapproval of the proposed plat.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant would like to step forward and provide a presentation.

Brian Lorenz, WD Partners, 7007 Discovery Boulevard, Dublin, Ohio 43017, introduced Bil Bowser, owner of the Noah Franchisee and Jeff Shettler with WD Partners, Civil Engineer and a couple of folks from the architectural team. Mr. Lorenz said the objective tonight is to gain feedback of the proposal specifically related to use and gain the comfort level of what this might look like going forward. He said they are not entirely sure about receiving a decision one way or another, but it is their intention to have general dialog and get the Commissions feelings.

Mr. Lorenz said they have been working with staff since mid-July and finally got significant plans together that merit the Commissions review. He said they were instructed to and felt it was important to meet with some of the neighbors and that meeting was held on December 10th. He said copies of the meeting minutes were provided. He said they chose the location in the middle of Perimeter Center and the proximity to businesses because of the facility is also geared toward a corporate atmosphere along with the family events. He said the site became available and it ties into the commercial fabric of the area and that is one of the biggest driving factors.

Bil Bowser, Park City, Utah, owner of Noah's, said the concept of Noah's is that they place themselves in this setting across the country because the corporate use comes within five miles and it is difficult to get a corporate user to travel a greater distance. He said the weekend business which is primarily wedding business will travel across Columbus to come to a location, this site has 168 brides on a hot leads list from all over greater Columbus. He said they bury their buildings in landscaping and did not believe they would find a facility anywhere in Dublin that is going to be more covered in flowers and landscaping than their building. He said the intent is to push the building off the road and they want the area to be quiet and they pick the locations to create a park like atmosphere. He said they are creating an environment that is suitable for a lot of people on the biggest day of their life. He said he heard comments of concerns of squealing tires and beer cans trashing the site. He said most people are good and they will not trash the area. He said they use all local vendors, local florist and will support local entrepreneurs and will allow people to do their own food. He said they chose Dublin because it is a city that fits what they are

trying to do both psychologically and physically. They are a destination facility and do not want to be on a busy a street, he said their events are scheduled six to 16 months in advanced. That is why they chose what they did, where they did and what they do.

Mr. Lorenz said they located the building back to provide a quiet environment for Noah's and also accommodate the residents across the road. He said they did a graphic from GIS and the distance from the neighbors is 575 feet. He said they tried to mitigate noise concerns. He said parking was explained and they are not sure what they will experience at this facility and felt 8 per 1000 is appropriate and if the need for shared parking arises they are open to addressing a shared agreement.

Jeff Shetler, WD Partners, said the storm water release rate that they ran across for the area is zero and in the text it is .01/acre and that gave them a .022 for this site and they modeled it and it was a 1/2 inch pipe out of the pond, which is impossible to do because it would block and flood immediately and therefore they are requesting an exemption to put a 3 inch pipe on it which make the release rate below what the pre-development would be. He said it was not adequate engineering wise to provide such a small outlet to allow potential flooding.

Mr. Lorenz said the infrastructure contributions is a criteria in the Code and they have not had any discussions but are open to having those discussions if need be.

Ron Hall, 6014 Kenzie Lane, said he is part of the Village at Coffman Park, and was fortunate enough to attend the meeting with WD Partners in December and is present as a homeowner concerned with traffic and parking along Wall Street, he said during the week they are experiencing issues getting onto Perimeter Drive from Wall Street around the 4 o'clock time and cannot fathom trying to get out with a business convention exiting at the same time with up to 200 cars getting out of Noah's facility along with him trying to get to the local grocery store. He said the noise even though they say there will be very little noise, the community is roughly 500 feet from the property and they may have over 100 weddings per year with up to 250 guests per wedding and that means every Friday and Saturday night there is going to be a wedding reception at this place and they are open till midnight with 250 guests with an outside back patio with catered liquor and all of that translates into noise and is an issue for the residents of Coffman Park Condos. He said he is worried about getting visitors from this facility to their quiet lake late at night on Friday and Saturday's nights because it is a beautiful area with a walking path around the lake that is available to the public. He said for those reasons and many more they are opposed to this proposal.

David Spyra, President of the Village of Coffman Park, said he echoes that they have canvased all eleven families and all agree with Mr. Hall's opinion and the neighborhood as a whole is strongly opposed to this rezoning. He said they thought this is a residential area and especially a party facility or an entertainment facility is inconsistent with residential neighborhood next door and the primary concerns are about noise, parking, traffic and have not yet heard anything to satisfy the situation. He said they would like to make it very clear that this is not the type of neighbor they would have expected and type of zoning they have come to expect.

Phil Weisenbach, 6013 Kenzie Lane, said his home faces the lake and he echoes the comments already said and he is concerned with parking in front of his home which is public and already there are problems with people parking in front of his house to fish at the lake and walk around and there is a lot of traffic and this facility will exasperate that situation. He said he bought into an area where there are businesses that operate 8 to 5 Monday through Friday and adding a party facility he would not want to live next to a place where there are parties on the weekends and deal with the traffic. He said it is not consistent with putting a facility like this near a residential community and is strongly opposed to it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were other comments from the general public. [There were none.]

Mr. Taylor said he is in agreement with most of the Planning analysis and has not yet heard anything to go against the recommendation. He said he felt bad for the residents of the Village at Coffman Park and thought they had it bad the last couple of months. He said the area is mostly businesses and it is a quiet place on the weekends and he strongly feels it should stay that way. He said the use is very much needed in Dublin and there are not very many facilities in the area. He said the Golf Course that holds such events is setback and the banquet hall is behind the building toward the golf course and does not interrupt the residents. He said in Dublin they are moving away from large parking fields in front of buildings and there are a few and is rare in open areas. He said he is pleased with the amount of landscaping proposed and the biggest issue on the site plan is that the parking should be in the back and the site is too small and it should be located on a site there is enough room to spread out and done appropriately or where parking is less of an issue such as the Bridge Street Corridor where the building could be built and appropriate with residents in a more urban area and commercial areas. He said the architecture of the building can be worked out, but the site plan issues and parking issues he is in agreement with Planning.

Mr. Hardt said he is intrigued by the business and agrees with Mr. Taylor and feels this is something sorely needed in Dublin and would like to welcome them to the community. He said he is not concerned about the business or the use generically speaking, but is concerned with the location. He agrees with the concerns of staff that are in the Planning Report and the noise issues with DJs playing until 12 o'clock at night he would have a hard time being convinced that it would not be heard by the residents across the street. He said this site is too small for this use and the setbacks proposed are not consistent with the other commercial buildings in the area, significant concerns with spot zoning one parcel, Perimeter Center PUD was put together as a cohesive development and changing the uses and development standards on a single parcel of land is antithesis to what the intention was of the district. He said he does not like the architecture but thought it could be resolved. He said he is concerned with the impact on the existing office buildings which is unresolved and said the parking is an issue. He said this building would be classified as an assembly use, similar to a restaurant or gathering hall and according to the building code they can lawfully put from 340 to 1,000 people in this building and 83 parking spaces do not add up in that context. He said for all the reasons he could not support this application.

Ms. Krumb said between the Planning Report and what has been said she agrees with the Report and if it was going to work on this site the building needed to be turned, so there is an entrance facing the street. She said she was not concerned with the use on this site, it was the parking and traffic that was a concern and if those were resolved she could get comfortable. She said she would like to know more on the patio space and make sure there will not be music outside. She said the planning report sums up all her comments.

Mr. Fishman said he agrees with the Commissioners, he said it is a right use but in a wrong location and parking is a huge issue. He said where ever they put it in Dublin and thought it should be a conditional use because of the intense use and thought there were better places for the facility.

Mr. Budde said agreed what had been said and is concerned about the neighbors, but really like the facility to be located somewhere within the community and felt it would be a great asset to Dublin.

Ms. Newell said she has experienced this personally and researched wedding venues and found bookings are as far as two years ahead of time if planning a larger function or event. She said this would be valuable within the community and would support the use. She said she is concerned with it being located so close to the residential property and those residents are aware of the commercial property in the area and expecting the commercial businesses to exit on the weekends and a large percentage of this business would be focused on Friday and Saturday and that concerned her. She said she understands the design of the building as two separate and private entrances to allow each event to have their own entrance to come into the facility and does not like the parking pushed at the street and they have an opportunity with a detention or a retention pond and use that in conjunction with the patio seating area

as another amenity. She said she cannot support changing the setbacks for parking and they have to be maintained along with the surrounding area and there is not enough area on this site within the current parcel to fit what they are proposing. She said the count on the occupancy of the building and a fair count would be approximately 500 occupants and for the number of the parking spaces, it would be six people per car and she could not envision that would not be enough parking for this type of facility. She said the landscape amenity is appreciated. She thought they could develop this project but they will have to do it better and more creative design and would love to have them in the City of Dublin but not in this particular site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agrees with the applicant and believes generally most people are good people. She said her concern is primarily on the parking, and she would love to see them in a commercial district where there could be a shared parking agreement with the parking lots that are vacant on the weekends and she thought it would be fantastic to have some cars in those on the weekends. She encouraged the applicant to look at that rather than building another field of parking that would only be occupied on nights and weekends, it would be nice to utilize some they already have. She said she is concerned with stormwater and when they chop up parcels and try to just barely make them fit what they end up with is a series of little puddles that are not sustainable aquatic environments and they are not large enough to sustain aquatic life and she would prefer to see there to be some sort of development plan for this area where there could be one location for stormwater. She said she is not concerned on the size of the facility and she thinks this is needed in the City of Dublin. She said she is concerned with subsequent users when they rezone it, it opens up a long list of things that could occupy this space once they are finished and it is a great concern.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they have heard their thoughts and they talked about wanting some feedback and was not sure what direction they would like to give and asked what the applicant prefers they do with this application.

Mr. Lorenz said they would like to request a tabling so they could take the comments back and compare them and take other measures as needed be.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to table the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Fishman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Planning if there were any communications items to discuss.

Claudia Husak said there is a conflict in scheduling of meetings in March and the State of the City Address is scheduled for March 6th and asked that the Commission bring their calendars to look at a different day in March.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it may be a Wednesday.

Ms. Husak said it would be March 5th and let them know at the next meeting.

Mr. Hardt said there is a possibility he will not be attending the February 6th meeting and will confirm and let them know.

Mr. Fishman said he will not be at the next meeting in January 23rd.

Roundtable

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable topics.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had requested meeting minutes in her packet and it is impossible for her to try to conduct the meeting and try read meeting minutes on her iPad at the same time and would like to have them in a paper format.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she really likes how EMH&T put the packet together for Avondale Woods and Tuller Flats and if they could give it as an example of what the Commission likes they would appreciate it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no additional items of discussion and adjourned the meeting at 11:14 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 20, 2014